## TARIFF DISCUSSION.

Speech of Hon. John Foos in the Buckeye Club Rooms Monday Evening. July 9th.

Trade Falincy and Solid Facts From the Records Pavoring the Republican Plan of Protection.

Following is the tariff speech in full o Hon. John Foos, delivered in the Buckeye 9th. There has been such a general demand for the speech that it will be published in pamphlet form for distribution. It is one of the most intelligent, intelligible and exhaustive discussions of the tariff question ever published, and should be read and pondered by ever voter into whose bands it comes:

The subject of my address this evening is

and national interests is not questioned. I only distrust his judgment, and it will be my effort this evening to show you that in his political economy he holds opinions that are not justified by the history of our coun-try, either in its agricultural or manufacturing interests, or the progress we have made in comparison with the nations of the world. I will show you that, almost without exception, every alleged fact or figure in his address is erroneous. If I can do this, of course the free trade idol he has spent so much time and trouble to erect ust fall to the gro

must fall to the ground.

Am I justified in saying that Mr.

Thomas's address was unquestionably in
favor of free trade, in face of the statement he made that if he were called upon to frame a tariff law he "would admit tre all raw materials required for the successful operation of our factories, for the reason that it would enable them to turn out aper goods for our own people and for outside markets; on everything else he ald impose a uniform duty, high enough raise the revenue wanted, which wor be more than enough to protect labor, but low enough to throttle all home combina-tions formed to raise prices?"

tions formed to raise prices?"

I am fully of the opinion that it was nothing more or less, so far as he advanced any arguments, than an out and out free trade address, and I will give you my rea-sons for calling it a free trade address. They are all taken from his printed speech and now for the proof:

In speaking of the tariff legislation in In speaking of the tall legislation this country, he says—I quote his exact words—"That it began in 1789 with the very first protective tariff, and has continued ever since. That tariff (the tariff of 1789) was a combination of selfish interests nd so was every other protective tariff

Certainly, if language means anything. Certainly, if language means anything. Mr. Thomas would never have voted for the tariff of 1789, and yet it was a low tariff—the lowest we have ever had in this country; under it cotton and woolen goods were imported at a duty of less than 5 per cent. Now if my friend Thomas would be satisfied with any rate of duty, certainly 5 per cent. per cent. would satisfy him; but it seems as though it did not, for he says of this tariff of 1789 that it was "a combination of selfish interests," thus showing conclusively that

and England.
In speaking of England, he says: "Her

commerce is fettered by no narrow-minded legislation; it sweeps over sea and conti-nent, creating a demand for goods and labor, and the demand makes the price. Our commerce is chained to the rock o home greed and avarice-has no seas to sweep or continents to traverse, and, while full of possibilities, it is dwarfed by re-strictions until it falls to be able to use the or so rapidly accumulating, and bence its decline in value."

Again, he says: "Not only is labor advancing in England under her liberal tariff, beginning in 1846, but her paupers are disappearing, her criminals are lessening and the price of goods cheapening." \* \* \*
"While as under our high tariff all is the

other way—more paupers, more criminals and higher prices for goods."

But this is not all. He still goes on eulogizing England and free trade until the thought enters his mind that he had possibly said too much, and he apologizes by saying that he is not culogizing England to the discredit of his corn country.

only necessary to say that he was a dele-gate to the St. Louis convention that nom-inated Mr. Cleveland and helped to endorse his free trade message of last December. The London (England) Times says: "The

The London (England) Tonce says: "The arguments which President Cleveland uses are those which Cobden used to employ forty-five years ago and which any English free trader would employ now." If President trader would employ now." dent Cleveland uses proceed to the control of the c ent Cleveland used just such arguments as obden, the father of English free traders,

First-More than anything else responsible for the many serious conflicts between

and-That it is more than anything se responsible for the high prices of many tured goods and for the burdens nder which farming interests are going

Third-That it is not a protection to labor, but is more than anything else re-sponsible for the depression in the labor

rth-That it is the foster parent of most of the trasts and combinations which are now extracting fortunes from the many,

conclusions will cover all the matter con-tained in his speech, I will now take up

First conclusion, which is: "That the tariff of 1861 is more than anything else responsible for the many serious conflicts between capital and labor." Now, it is a very easy thing to make a tatement, and often a very difficult matte

statement, and often a very difficult matter to prove it. The simple statement is made, that the tariff of 1861 is more than any thing else the cause of the conflict between capital and labor. He says that the tariff of 1861 "Is remorseless in its inflictions upon the aunfavored and unprotected." But this is only his opinion, and is worth no more than an opinion. If the high tariff of 1861 is more than anything else responsible for the conflict between capital club rooms, this city. Monday evening, July and labor, it must be that labor does not receive as good pay as under the low tariff of 1846. This tariff of 1846 was in opera-tion from June, 1846, to June, 1857, and many of you know quite well enough that labor is today more than 25 percent, higher. It is a fact within your own knowledge, and many of you have good reasons for knowing it, as you were working for wages

during that time.

No, the tariff of 1861 did not lower wages; on the contrary, wages have been higher since 1861 than ever before in this

The subject of my address this evening is not wholly of my own selection, but was suggested to me by friends. This suggestion, however, met my own wishes, and I will therefore talk to you upon the "Tariff," or protection to our home industries.

It is perhaps well understood by most of you that my address will be devoted to answering the free trade address of our fellow citizen, the Hon. John H. Thomas, delivered before the Jefi-rson club, a democratic organization of this city, and repeated, by request, at Black's opera house a few weeks since.

I desire to state now, that in Mr. Thomas I recognize a man whom our citizens, without distinction of party, esteem very highly. I know of no trust, public or private, placed under his care, that has not received his most careful attention, but I have not now to deal with him as a municipal legislator, or as holding any municipal trust, nor as a citizen, but must deal with him as a public man, seeking state and national trusts.

That he is honest in his views as to state and national interests is not questioned. I only distrust his judgment, and it will be my effort this evening to show your that in There is not a person old enough to have

not one—on which to base it.

There is not a person old enough to have purchased anything in the way of clothing previous to 1861 but knows that goods are much lower today than ever before. much lower today than ever before.

If this is the fact, then the high tariff of
1861 could not have caused the conflict
between capital and labor.

Now, if it were neither low wages nor

Now, if it were neither low wages nor the high price of clothing that caused the numerous strikes in the past few years, then what was it that did cause them? Was it the high price of living? My friend Thomas will hardly claim that it is, as he in his speech distinctly states that wheat, corn, etc., were higher under the low tariff of 1846 than under the high tariff of 1861.

under which we are living today.

Now let us admit this one statemen of Mr. Thomas to be true, and we are irre of Mr. Thomas to be true, and we are irresistably forced to the conclusion that the tariff of 1861 has not been the cause, in the remotest degree, of the conflict between capital and labor—why should it be?

Labor may not—indeed is not, as well paid as it ought to be, but every laboring man of middle age knows that today he is receiving 25 to 35 per cent. more wages than from 1864 and huys everything

than from 1846 to 1861, and buys everything

heaper. It follows then, that the conclusion that Mr. Thomas has reached cannot be sus-tained. There is not a particle of evidence offered to sustain it, and we may safely conclude that there is no eviden is nothing but an opinion backed by no proof, and has no market value whatever. We come now to his second conclusion which is that "That the tariff of 1861 i more than anything else responsible for the high price of many manufactured goods, and for the burdens under which the

and for the burdens under which the farming interests are going down."

I will first examine his conclusion that the "Tariff of 18861 is more than anything else responsible for the thigh prices of many manufactured goods."

You would very naturally suppose that when a gentleman in a public address states a proposition like the one I have just read, he would offer some proof—name a few of the articles in common use that are of the articles in common use that are higher today under and because of the tariff of 1851 than they were under the low tariff of 1846.

If any of you read his address (and I Let me quote from him still further to bow his love and admiration for free trade if you will point out any attempt to prove it, except the statement that we collect an average duty of 46 per cent, on manufac average duty of 46 per cent. on manufac-tured goods. Now, if a duty of 46 per cent. has advanced the price of manufac-tured goods consumed by the great body of our people, he should have named them? Possibly there may be some exceptional cases, but I candidly say to you, I cannot now call to mind a single srticle that is higher; but on the contrary, almost, if not pertirely without acception, manufactured entirely without exception, manufactured goods are cheaper today than ever before

in the history of our country.

Gentlemen who undertake to instruct
the public should be very careful in their

Let us see what are the facts con the average duty of 46 per cent. on mant factured goods levied by the tariff of 1861, about which our free trade friends have so

much to say.

We deny the truth of the statement that an average duty of 46 per cent. is collected on manufactured goods, such as are conmed by the ma es of this country. It is saying that he is not eulogizing Engrand the discredit of his own country.

I would suggest that if this eulogy of England was not for the purpose of discrediting the United States, and in advocacy of free trade, then language has lost its force and meaning.

If anything further were necessary to the the trader of the properties of th

cent instead of 46 per cent., and the impor-pertations for the past year will vary but little from the year 1885. I desire now to tell you how this 45 per cent. duty is made out. and I think I will

be able to show you conclusively that we do not collect an average duty of 46 cent on such manufactured goods as we import. To do this I will show you how our democratic free trade friends make up this average duty of 46 per cent.

forms, and the government would lose a large amount of revenue. There are many other articles on which the duty is still higher, ranging up to nearly 300 per cent-which only protects the government from fraud in its internal revenue system and donot protect either woolen or cotton goods.

But our free trade friends are
compelled to add them all in to bring the
average duty up to 46 per cent. I will no

criticise their argument, but leave it to you to say whether it is honest. It seems to me, and I think you will ad-mit, that we do not pay an average duty of 46 per cent, on such goods as we import and which are also manufactured in this

eountry.

Now let us see what we did pay for goods

	Raw Coston	Shandard	Bleached Shirtings	Standard Prints	Print Cloths
1547	11 21	8 25	14 94	11 83	6 01
1560	11 60	8 73	15 54	9 5r	5 44
1880	11 51	8 51	12 74	7 41	4 51
1885	10 45	6 71	10 6	6 6	3 12

	Raw Cotton	Stan fard Sheetings	Bleached Shirtings	Standard Prints	Print Clothes.
1847 1861	11.10	8.50	15.23	10.66	5.7234
1880 1885	10.98	7,63	11.55	6.70	3,81

This shows a decrease in the price of raw cotton of only 1/2 cent per pound, while the manufactured cotton, such as sheetings, shirtings, print and print cloths had declined from 10 to 40 per cent.

Bleached sheetings had declined 3%

ents per yard. Standard prints or calico had declined 4

ents per vard. Print clothes nearly 2 cents per yard under the high tariff of 1861, or, in other words, these goods were and are now selling at from 3 to 4 cents per yard less than the same quality sold at under the low tariff of 1846.

Please remember that these figures are taken from the official report of the govern-

This shows conclusively the result of the low tariff of 1846 as compared with the high tariff of 1861. Cotton cloths from 10 high tariff of 1861. Cotton cious from 10
to 40 per cent. cheaper, and yet our free
trade friends are not satisfied, but will
probably go on forever teiling you of the
"cruel and remorseless tariff of 1861,"
when, as a fact, you can buy better cotton
goods and at as low prices as in "Free
Trade England."
In proof of this, let me say to you that

In proof of this, let me say to you that for the past few years we have been ship-ping millions of yards of cotton goods to England. They can be found on sale in Liverpool, Manchester, London and other English cities.

We have now shown what the value of

manufactured cotton goods was under the low tariff of 1846 as compared with the high tariff of 1861.

high tariff of 1861.

If we examine our woolen manufactures a similar result will be found. E pecially will this be the case in such woolen goods as are used by the great body of the people.

Coarse woolen clothes that were worth \$1.50 per yard previous to 1861, can now be bought for \$1 to \$1.25. Good, substantial cassimeres that were worth \$1 per yard are now sold at 80 to 85 cents. Jeans that averaged 50 cents per yard from 1850 to 1860, can now be had at 40 to 45 cents.

The leading member of perhaps the largest wholesale house in America, says that the ordinary cotton and woolen goods are selling at lower prices than in England.

Mr. Schoenhof, a free trader appointed
by the present administration as consul to
Turnstall, England, writes to the state deby the present administration as consultof Turnstall, Engiand, writes to the state department at Washington as follows: "So far as clothing and dry goods in general are concerned. I find that cotton goods are fully as cheap in the United States as here. Shirtings and sheetings, if anything are superior in quality, for the same money, with us. So far as I can judge from the articles exposed for sale in the retail stores, articles of underwear for women, made of muslin, are far superor in workmanship and finish and cheaper in prices in the United States. Nor can I find that men's shirts when chiefly of cotton, are cheaper here. Of boots and shoes, if factory made, the same may be said."

In further proof of the low price of woolen goods. I will relate an instance that

woolen goods, I will relate an instance that occurred in New York at one of the sessions

of the tariff commission in 1882, Some gentlemen present were deploring the high price of clothing, when a gentle-man from Pennsylvania arose and said: "I am here as a standing illustration that the statements made by these gentlemen are not true. I have on a suit of clothes that I have worn in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America for the past nine months, and the suit only cost me \$15 in New York." But this was in 1882. In 1888 they are

till cheaper.

Look at the daily papers of our own city and you will see all-wool suits, warranted, advertised to be sold for \$10.

You may take the average price of ready

made clothing today, and it is fully 30 per cent, cheaper than in 1860, and all classes of domestic dress goods are quite as much reduced in price.

These facts are within the knowledge of

any of you gentlemen who purchased goods previous to 1860, and when you are told previous to 1860, and when you are told that you are paying 50 cent. more for your clothing than you ought, because of the high tariff of 1861, you know it is not true, and yet Mr. Thomas makes the statement that you are paying 50 per cent. too much.
If you are paying it, then instead of paying \$10 you should only pay \$5 for a suit,

and if you only paid \$5 what kind of a living do you suppose the farmer would make who grew the wool, or the workmen who spun and dyed the yarn and wove the cloth, or he who cut and made the suit? Let me say that when it is an accomlished fact that you can buy a good suit of voolen clothing for \$5 you have accompilshed another result—a result that is far-reaching and fatal to the homes of every laboring man and woman of our country— you have reduced the wages one half that you may be able to buy your clothing at half its value—and this is free trade.

This follows:

Think of it, my fellow-citizens! If you like it, and think it a good thing, then vote for free trade. This is the result of compe tition with the world—competition with half paid labor of Europe—labor that eats meat once a week, once a month, or none

I believe in a different theory—in another kind of political economy. I believe in the economy of protection—something that will put up rather than pull down the value of labor. Home competion is quite suffi-cient to reduce prices.

I would like to ask my friend Thomas if he has found any competition in the manu-facture of hay rakes, an article he has manufactured largely for some years. They are a first-class article, as good, if not the best, on the market. I would ask him, what are the prices of rakes today, com-pared with the prices received five years since. If he auswered the question, it would be that prices are fully 25 to 33 per

ent. lower.

My opinion is that he has found home The next point in his second conclusion

"That the tariff of 1861 is responsible for the burdens under which the farming in-terests are going down."

Now I deny the correctness of this statement. I deny that the farming interests are going down because of the tariff of 1861, and I further deny that they are

going down at all.

There are times in the life of every nation when some one industry, or per haps many industries, are not prosperous, and these industries are so closely connected with others that when any nected with others that when any one is depressed, it affects the prosperity of all.

A failure of crops would not only depress

the farming interests, but would also affect every other industry in the country. We would hear the cry of "hard times" not only from the farmers, but from every mill and mine, every machine shop and factory in the country. A monetary panic may be equally disas-

when almost every bank in the country suspended. Then came the panic of 1873, from which the country did not fully

In 1885 our farmers had increased the

number of sheep to 50,360,248, a gain of 8,108,169 head in five years, producing nearly all the wool used in this country, except a low grade of carpet wool, valued at 10 cents per pound, which we do not and possibly can not produce at a profit. Our free trade friends make so great an outery for free wool, that the people gen-erally suppose that a very large amount of clothing wools are imported every year to outery for free wool, that the pe supply the wants of our woolen mills and

we imported clothing wools in 1885 to the value of only \$2,262,824—an insignificant amount as compared with the 300,000-000 pounds grown by our own farmers the same year.

There are other farming interests, the statistics of which are interesting, as they show the increase of our agricultural pro-In 1860 there were 6,249,174 head of

In 1850 there were were 10,357,588 of horses—increase 60 per cent. In 1860 there were 25,620,119 head of In 1880 there were 35,925,511 head of

cattle—increase more than 40 per cent.
In 1860 there were 33,513,867 head of In 1880 there were 47,681,700 head of hogs—increase more than 40 per cent. In 1860 we produced 173, 104,924 bushe

In 1880 we produced 498,549,868 bushel wheat—increase nearly 200 per cent. In 1860 we produced 838,792,749 bushels In 1880 we produced 1,754,591,676 bushels

of corn—increase more than 100 per cent.
In 1860 there were 163,110,720 acres imroved land. In 1880 there were 287,211,845 acres improved land-increase more than 70

In 1880 the value of farms was \$16,197,-161,905—increase more than 50 per cent. In 1860 value of farm implements and

nachinery \$246,000,000.
In 1880 value of farm implements and achinery, \$406,000,000—an increase of nearly 75 per cent.

These statistics cannot be doubted. They

are taken from official documents of the government, and are beyond question as nearly accurate as it is possible to make Now, in view of the facts I have given you, regarding the increase of our agricul-tural interests, how can it be possible for any man to come to the conclusion that our farming interests are going down, either cause of the tariff of 1861 or for any other

And yet Mr. Thomas says they are going down. Possibly he may believe it, but it is doubtful if he can find any other person

Next we have his fourth conclusion which reads as follows:
"That the tariff of 1861 is the toster parent of most of the 'trusts' and 'combinations' which are now extracting fortune from the many for the pride and glory of the few."
I would have been pleased had the gentle

I would have been pleased had the gentle-man named a few of the "trusts" that have been fostered by the tariff of 1861.

Does he mean the Standard Oil Co., or "trust." if you please to call it by that name? This is the largest manufacturing industry in the country, under the control of one company, but it is not protected by any tariff, as it has no foreign competition. Certainly he does not mean the cotton Certainly he does not mean the cotton seed oil trust? The tariff of 1861 could no

seed of trust? The tarm of 1801 could not protect cotton seed oil, for neither has it a foreign competitor.

Does he mean the sugar trust? Perhaps he had this in his mind when he coucluded that the tariff of 1851 was the foster parent of "trusts." If so, let me ask him if the tariff of 1861 or any other tariff is responsi-ble for it. Other parties as well as those composing the sugar trust can import sugar and at the same price as paid by the sugar "trusts." If so, let me ask him if the tariff of 1861 or any other tariff is responsible for it. Other parties as well as those composing the sugar trust can import sugar and at the same price as paid by the sugar trust. There is no law to prevent any one from going into the business; the tariff does the direction in which relief should come. not give any one the exclusive right to im-port sugar or anything else. Then why charge the tariff with being responsible for charge the tariff with being responsible for what are termed 'trusts'? Suppose there was no duty on foreign sugar—that it came in free—would this prevent a combination of capitalists to control the market? Most

ssuredly not.

For the proof of this, I need but refer you to California—there they have had free sugar for more than ten years, yet the price has been higher than duty-paid sugar in

One man, Claus Spreckles, has controlled the markets of Culifornia for ten years, and only during the past year have price been reduced.

been reduced.

Then free sugar will not prevent a trust, or control of the market.

For further proof, I refer you to the copper syndicate in Europe. The markets of free trade England are completely under the control of this syndicate, which puts up or down the prices as it pleases without regard to either free trade or a protective tariff.

If my free trade friends would permit me to make the suggestion I would say that the copper syndicate should nave more re-pect for free trade Eugland.

re-pect for free trade England.

I am rather inclined to think that the gentleman, when he framed his fourth conclusion, intended it more as a rhetorica display than anything serious. There is nothing in it, and I pass on to his fifth con clusion, in which he says that "Every tariff from 1789 to the present, in proportion as it was levied for protection, in that proportion injured farmer and laborer, because one of its objects was to render farming less profitable in order to make the cost of labor to the factory cheaper."
Here my fellow-citizens, you have a cor

clusion that is as sweeping as it is unjust. Think of it, for a hundred years, more or less of the legislation of this country was for the avowed purpose of reducing the price of labor. Sometimes language is so sweeping that it loses its effect and this, it seems to me, is of that character. It is almost incredible that the geutleman could have formed such a conclusion.

Does he not know that Washington, Mad-

son. Monroe and Jackson were in favor of a tar ff, not only for revenue, but also for protection? and can it be believed that they were in favor of reducing the price of labor? For fear that you may think I do not state their opinions correctly, I will read some extracts from the pen of each, favoring the protection of our industries.

selves; we must now place the manu-facturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. The grand inquiry is, now, shall we make comforts, or go without them at the will of another nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence on that nation or be clothed in skins and live like which alone excellence of quality and proud to say I am not of them. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comforts, and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign, where an equivalent domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to any difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not have a supply at home, equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand that has so long violated it." Is not this sufficient evidence that Jefferson favored the protection of our domestic man

we then have Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson favoring the protection of home industries, and now do any of you imagine that these men favored protection for the purpose of making farming less profitable in order to reduce the cost of labor to the factory? And yet, according to the fifth and last conclusion of cording to the fifth and last conclusion of my friend Thomas, this is just what they mat have done. They were great factors in the early history of the country. They shaped all legislation and molded public opinion, but certainly were never before charged with favoring a reduction of the orice of labor.

I need not speak of the other great names that come after them, as they were as free from the crime as those I have already

mentioned.

I will not pursue this line of thought farther, but will examine into the truth or faisity of the charge that protection injures both the farmer and laborer. To do this a protective tariff must reduce the value of the laborer. I deny that it does, and I appeal to the history and results of our tariff legislation for the proof of my position. I make the statement that atraiff for revenue only has always left the government in debt and our industries depressed. I now make the further statement that every tariff levied for revenue and protection has always either freed the government from debt, or reduced the debt and increased our farming and manufacturing interests, and advanced

reduced the doot and increased our farming and manufacturing interests, and advanced the wages of the workingman.

Let us see if this is true. We will go back to 1789. Up to that year we had been living under free trade, and any one who will investigate the condition of affairs at that time must admit that our country was

That you may fully understand the con-That you may fully understand the condition of the country at that time. Ind why the people felt depressed, it is only necessary to say that the balance of trade was against them; and to show you the effect upon any country when the balance of trade is against it, it is only necessary that you see what effect the balance of trade has had upon this country, from the time it became an independent nation up to 1861. To do this I will give you a short history of against them; and to show you the effect upon any country when the balance of trade is against it, it is only necessary that you see what effect the balance of trade has had upon this country, from the time it became an independent nation up to 1861. To do this I will give you a short history of the various tariffs passed by congress from 1789 to 1861. Up to the year 1789 we had free trade in its most unlimited sense. The result was that in 1789, during seven years of free trade, the importation of foreign party, again came into power, and the low result was that in 1789, during seven years of free trade, the importation of foreign goods amounted to eighty-five million dol-lars (\$85,000,000) and our exports to thirty-three million dollars (\$33,000,000), leaving a balance of trade against us amounting to fifty-two million dollars (\$52,000,000). At this day this might, not be considered a They requested that congress should protect the manufacturing interests by imposing a duty on foreign importations—on for-eign goods that came in competition with

Hence, in 1789, congress passed the first bill imposing duties on the products of for-eign countries. The duties levied were eight. In 1790 congress passed an act in-creasing the duties on imported goods. In 1791-91-94 and in the year 1800 other bills were passed, each bill increasing the

utie these various bills brought about the following results: In seven years, from 1795 to 1801, our importation of foreign goods ounted to one hundred and twelve lion, thirty thousand, eight hundred and twenty-four dollars (\$112,030,824) and our exports during the same time amounted to two hundred and one million, four hundred and five thousand, one hundred and thirtynine dollars (\$201,405,1:9), leaving a bo ance of trade in our favor amounting to eighty-nine million, three hundred and seventy-four thousand, three hundred and fif-teen dollars (\$89,374 \$15).

This shows the difference in results be-tween free trade and protection. In seven years, under free trade, the balance of trade against us amounted to fifty-two mil-lion dollars (852.000,000), while in seven years, under a protective tariff, the balance of trade was not only not against us, but was eighty-nine million, three hundred and seventy-four thousand, three hundred and fifteen dollars (\$99,374,315) in our favor.

This was unquestionably the result of protection given by the various tariff acts

from 1789 to 1800. We began to export more than we imported. We sold more goods than we bought, and this is one of the sources of the wealth of nations as well as of individuals. No nation can continue to import more than she exports without becoming impover-ished. The result is the same with individuais. He who buys more than he sells be-comes poor, and he who sells more than he buys will eventually become rich.

The next tariff bill passed by congress was in 1804, again increasing the duties, and the prosperity of the country con-

Unhappily, this state of prosperity was not permitted to continue. We had then as now, a free trade or "revenue only party, and in 1807, and again in 1808, the tariff on foreign productions was reduced. The effect of these reductions left us a debt of thirty-nine million dollars (\$39,000,000) Washington, in his last message, said:
"Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed its attention to the encourfor revenue only" we were unable to meet gement of manufactures. The object is of the necessary public expenditures. And no much consequence not to insure a conagement of manufactures. The object is to much con sequence not to insure a continuation of your efforts in every way which shall appear eligible "Ought our country to without a single exception. It will also be without a single exception. It will also be country.

Now let us see what we did pay for goods for the pride and glory of the few.

Fifth—That every tairlif from 1789 to the present, in proportion as it was levised for the same standard goods from 1847 to 1850. I leave out the prices for goods from 1847 to 1850. I leave out the prices for goods from 1850 to 1850, because we were not doing in order to make the cost of labor to the factory cheaper.

In answering his speech I will reply to the first onclusions encodes an entire third conclusions because his his state-unear was made the order in which the 'as state-unear was made he would take them up in the order in which they were stated, and proceed to stone them—this being the usual course, not he did not do so—in fact, he never even the mere report to them afterwards.

However, as a discussion of these five

How have the seems in the panic of 1857, head of sheep.

So what we did pay for goods from 1847 to 1850, her all the part of the pride and glory of the few.

Now let us seems that did goods from 1847 to 1850, her all the proportion as it was levised for the same standard goods from 1847 to 1850, her all the proportion as it was levised for the same standard goods from 1847 to 1850, her all public every until 1850, all the country will 1850, all the worm that therefore see how it is for the same and products of our farms. I cammat therefore see how it is the factory chapter.

How hall appear elligible.

Now held the country will inso the accusted the proportion as it was levised for the same standard goods from 1847 to 1850.

But If we compare the three decades from 1850 to 1850, we will find a constant increase in the value and products of our farms. I cammat therefore see how it is for the state-ment, and independence, will not the accurate the constitutional power of other considerations.

We have the following average prices, and the products of our farms. I cammat therefore see

for 1847 and 1860 and compare them with the average value in 1880 and 1885, we that could be done under the low or free have the following result:

| Again, in speaking of our manufactures, he is speaking of our manufactures, he is says: "Their preservation, which depends" in the cradle the manufactures in the United Says: "Their preservation, which depends is says: "Thei trade tariff of 1846.

In 1870 our farmers had 28,477,961 head of sheep, a gain of 6,006,676 in 10 years.

This shows an increase of more than 25 per cent under the high tariff of 1861, while under the low tariff of 1846, for the same number or years, the increase was less than 4 per cent.

In 1880 our farmers owned 42,193,074 head of sheep, an increase of 13,714,123 head in 10 years.

In 1885 our farmers had lockness that is principally as manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existing the high interests of the nation."

Jac'son, in his first message, declares: "That it is principally as manufactures to things." I might read many other extracts from speeches made in the British parliament by Lord Brougham. He said: "It is worth while to incur a loss upon first exportations in order to stife in the eradic the manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existing the high interests of the nation."

Jac'son, in his first message, declares: "That it is principally as manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existing the high interests of the nation."

Jac'son, in his first message, declares: "That it is principally as manufactures, he upon first exportations in order to stife in the eradic the manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existing the high interests of the nation."

Jac'son, in his first message, declares: "That it is principally as manufactures, he upon first exportations in order to stife in the eradic the manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existing the result of the principal states and commerce tend to increase the value of agricultural productions, and to extend the principal states which the war had forced into exist. That it is principally as manufactures, he said: "It is worth while to incur a loss."

Jac'son, in his first message, declares: "That it is principally as manufactures, he said: "It is worth while to incur a loss."

Jac'son, in his first message, declares: "That it

of society, that they deserve the fostering care of the government."

What shall we say of Jefferson, claimed as the father of the democratic party? Let him speak for himself. In his letter written in 1816 to Benjamin Austin, he says:

"That to be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them for ourof life, we must fabricate them for ourwages above those paid in better peopled countries of Europe.

"Besides the effect which this state of the

be grand supply of labor has in increasing the cost our own of the article, it is adverse to the proper which alone excellence of quality and steady production of quantity are to be ob-tained."

Here we have the English idea of the condition of the American laborer before we are ready for free trade in this country He must be willing to accept lower wages he must be less independent, and must sul mit to more discipline.

As our free trade or tariff for "revenue only" friends refer us to England as an ideal free trade nation—in fact the only civ-

ilized free trade nation—we must, course, infer that they believe in lo wages, less independence and better disci-pline on the part of the workingman. But let us return to the history of the tariff.

To overcome the excessive importations of English goods in the American markets, the tariff bilis of 1816-17 were passed, increasing the duties in foreign goods; but the importations in 1816 17 were so large that but little effect was felt from a protective tariff until 1820-21, when our manufactures again began to revive. In 1834-98 the tariff was again locreased

placed in a flourishing condition.

The tariff of 1825 enabled us to pay of the public debt by July 1st, 1833—again proving the superiority of a protective

ln 1830 our free trade friends becam very active and by 1832 the country seemes almost ripe for war. The

revenue basis since the beginning of government.

government.

The revenue fell off thirty-three million dollars (\$33,000,000) per annum from 1833 to 1837, and to less than twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) from 1837 to 1841, the expenditures exceeding the income more than thirty million dollars, (\$30,000,000)

To enable the government to meet the necessary expenditures and pay the public debt the tariff of 1843 was passed. necessary expenditures and pay the public debt, the tariff of 1843 was passed. This was a tariff for protection and recenue. During the four years it was it

party, again came into power, and the low tariff of 1846 was passed, and with the same result that had followed every low tariff. The receipts were not sufficient to meet the expenditures, and the public debt was increased from \$15.550,263 to \$28,-

twenty-eight million, six hundred and ninety-nine thousand, eight hundred and thirty-one dollars (\$28,699,831), in 1857, to ninety million, five hundred and eighty thousand, eight hundred and seventy-three dollars (\$90,580,873) in 1861.

Here I close this short history of the various tariff acts and their results from 1789 to 1841. It would be useless to instia comparison of the receceipts and expen-ditures of the various revenue acts up to 1861 with those that came after that time From 1861 up to the present time, the expenditures have necessarily been so large that it required extraordinary financial skill to meet them, and yet the high tariff of 1861 did it successfully, and without crippling a single industry. But enough has been shown to prove

without a single exception, that at th termination of every low tariff, the public debt had been increased, the expenditures exceeding the receipts.

I have also shown that at the termination I have also shown that at the termination of every protective tariff, without a single exception, the public debt was either paid off or largely reduced, and the industries left in a flourishing condition, and of course the wages of the laboring man were better. The free trade, or low tariff party, are in the habit of referring to the low tariff of 1846 as the best tariff we have ever had, but I could have understand why. If to

1846 as the best tariff we have ever had, but I could never understand why. If to increase the public debt was a good thing, then it did that. If to so legislate as to send more than a thousand million dollars-in gold to Europe was a wise policy, then it did that. From 1849 to 1861 we received from the gold mines of California, eleven nundred million dollars in gold, not a dollar of which could be found this side the Atlantic

Ocean in 1861. If to leave the government bankrupt in 1861 was a good thing, then it did that.

Now, I have discussed the fifth and last conclusion of my friend, not because I thought for one moment that you believed it could be true, but more particularly because I desired to give in a condensed because I desired to give in a condensed manner the results of the various tariff laws passed by congress from 1789 to 1861. This I have done, and leave you to decide whether it is to your interest to vote for free trade or for protection.

I have now finished my comments on the five conclusions arrived at by my friend.

five conclusions arrived at by my friend, but I find much other matter in his adress which needs correction.

First—I do not agree with him in his statement of the relative wages paid in this

country and England.

Ordinarily laboring men do not seek locations where labor is cheaper and living locations where labor is cheaper and living higher. Now, if we take the gentleman's statement as to the price of labor and the relative cost of living in England, as compared with this country, it proves too much. His whole argument is to show that a laboring man is better off in England than in the United States. Now there is not one of you who could possible believe. not one of you who could possibly believe such a statement. You have the evidence to the contrary. Every day there are many immigrants of the laboring classes from Great Britain arriving in this country. In 1887 England furnished 72,855. Ireland 65, 370. Scotland 18,099.

Do you suppose they came here because wages are about as low and living higher Do you suppose they leave England, where, according to my friend, wages are about as high, clothing about 45 per cent, cheaper, rent 60 per cent, board and lodging 30 per cent, fuel 60 per cent, and groceries 23 per cent, cheaper, bread and neat only being 25 per cent higher. If you put these per centages together

Continued on Seventh Page.



not be overestimated, for without pure blood you cannot enjoy good health. At this season nearly every one needs a good medicine to purify, vitalize, and enrich the blood, and Hood's Sarsaparilla is worthy your confidence. It is peculiar in that it strengthens and builds up the system, creates an appetite, and tones the digestion, while t eradicates disease. Give it a trial. Hood's Sursaparilla is sold by all druggists.

Prepared by C. L. Hood & Co., Lowell, Mass. 100 Doses One Dollar

HUMPHREYS'

HOMEOPATHIC VETERINARY SPECIFICS For Horses, Cattle, Sheep, Dogs, Hogs, Poultry.

500 PAGE BOOK on Treatment of Animals and
Chart Sent Free. 13) CHAIT Sent Free,
CURIN-Fevers, Congestions, Inflammation
A.A.—Spinal Meningitis, Milk Fever,
B.B.—Strains, Lameness, Rheumation
C. C.—Bistemper, Nasal Discharges,
D. D.—Bats or Grubs, Worms,
E. E.—Coughs, Heaves, Freumonia,
F. F.—Colle or Gripes, Bellynche,
C. G.—Miscarringe, Hemorringes,
J. K.—Congession, Missane,
J. K.—Discasses of Digestion.

Manual Metals of Congestion,
Manual Metals of

Stable Case, with Specifics, Manual, Witch Hazel Oil and Medicator, 27,00 Price, Single Bottle (over 16 doses) .
Sold by Druggists; or Sent Prepaid on Receipt of Price. umphreys' Med. Co., 109 Fulton St., N. Y.

2 HUMPHREYS HOMEOPATHIC O SPECIFIC No. 60 Nervous Debility, Vital Weakness and Prostration, from over work or other cause \$1 per vial, or 5 vials and large vial powder, for \$ SOLD BY Data capers, or sent pestpaid on exceipt orion—Hamphory, Rediting Co., 100 ration St. \$.

Do no' buy any more "Poor Rubber Hose," but put your money in the

"Spiral" Cotton Hose. SPIRAL



Lighter, Cheaper and better than the best rubber hose.

hest rubber hose.

Made on the same principle as the rubberlined hose used in Fire Departments, which
last for years.

The cotton duck used in all rubber hose
traws in water, wherever exposed, as a wick
absorbs oil, and being confined by rubber, generates a suiphurous gas, quickly destroying
the best rubber hose. The "Spiral" Hose,
having no outside covering to imprison the
noisitre, with dry like a tower.

Thereare imitations so buy only that which
has one red line ruming through it, and
which is branded "Spiral" patented March 30,
30. If your dealer does not have it in stock,
let him get?

Sample autiled trang oblives for six cents.

BOSTON WOVEN BOSE CO. Sole Wille 234 DEVONSHIRE STREET, BOSTON, MASS. 222 LAKE STREET, CHICAGO.

FOR MEMPHIS & NEW ORLEANS 1.600 MILES FOR \$18!

A fraction over a cent a mile, including meals and statersoms. Memphis and Cluciar nati Packet Co. offers Special Excursion Rates to its patrons for the next Sixty Days. \$18 Clucianati to Memphis and return, including meals and rooms or roote and while in Mem-

Bosts leave Wednesdays and Saturd: 24 at Boats leave we unescape to be more to be more than the first made to parties desiring to make short trips; to go on one beat and return on another; to go 100 miles on 16,000 miles, as you wish; to be absent one day or twelve. Through rates to Little Rock, Hot. Springs, Plac Bluff, Texas points, St. Louis, Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers.

J. C. DORMAN.

Agent, No. II, Pub. Landing, Cincinnatt, O. CHEAM BALM CREAM BALLOUS CHEAM BALLOUS CHEAM BALLOUS COLORS COLOR ELY'S CATARRH Restores the Sens s of Taste

Try the Cure HAY-FEVER Aparticle is applied into each nostril and is acreeable. Price So cents at Druggish; be mail, registered, 60 cts. ELY SROS., 50 Warren St., New York.

THIS IS WORTH "SKIN 01,000. TO ANY MAN, WOMAN OR CHILD who is not blessed with SUCCESS a fair, healthy Skin, or is troubled with humors "Twin Harvels of Binding." At druggists, Skin-Surve Se, & No. Skin-Success Sc

SOAP & Sim-Species Support

For sale by V. & S. Coblentz.

dering from any of the results of youthfur discretions or abuses, resulting in Semina earness, Impotency, Lost Manhood, etc., it, SAWYER'S TRUE SPECIFIC WIL



R. W. Tansill & Co., (Merchant on is) in

TANSILL'S NCH 5¢

Adam Schmidt, Bevington & Holloway